UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/575,174	04/07/2006	Yuki Miura	448252001600	6816

20872   7590   08/06/2010

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
425 MARKET STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105-2482

EXAMINER
STORK, KYLE R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/06/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _26 July 2010_.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-19_ is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) _1-19_ is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This non-final office action is in response to the RCE and amendment filed 26

July 2010.

2.   Claims 1-19 are pending. Claims 1, 10, and 19 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3.   The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4.   Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to

comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter

which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to

one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed,

had possession of the claimed invention.

With respect to claims 1, 10, and 19, the applicant claims use of "an equivalent

structure, which is equivalent to the prescribed structure generated by the information

browsing unit but is not converted from acquired document data (claim 1, lines 10-12)."

However, the information browsing unit acquires and analyzes a document (claim 1,

lines 3-4). Additionally, the information browsing unit "converts the acquired document

data into layout data having a prescribed structure based on result of the analysis (claim

1, lines 4-5). It is unclear how the structure of the acquired document is able to be

converted by the information browsing unit, yet unconverted when used by the

information providing unit. The applicant's specification fails to clarify the issue. As such, these claims are rejected.

Claims 2-9 and 11-18 are rejected based upon their dependence upon a rejected based claim.

5.   Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

With respect to claims 1, 10, and 19, the applicant claims use of "an equivalent structure, which is equivalent to the prescribed structure generated by the information browsing unit but is not converted from acquired document data (claim 1, lines 10-12)." However, the information browsing unit acquires and analyzes a document (claim 1, lines 3-4). Additionally, the information browsing unit "converts the acquired document data into layout data having a prescribed structure based on result of the analysis (claim 1, lines 4-5). It is unclear how the structure of the acquired document is able to be converted by the information browsing unit, yet unconverted when used by the information providing unit. The applicant's specification fails to clarify the issue. As such, these claims are rejected.

Claims 2-9 and 11-18 are rejected based upon their dependence upon a rejected based claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7.   Claims 1-19 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Beranek et al. (GB 2329309, published 17 March 1999) and further in view of Fisher et

al. (US 2005/0091224, filed 22 October 2003, hereafter Fisher).

As per independent claim 1, Beranek discloses a device information display

system for displaying device internal information of one or more information devices,

comprising:

an information browsing unit which acquires and analyzes document data

described in a markup language, converts the acquired document data into layout data

having a prescribed structure based on results of the analysis, and makes a display

based on the layout data (page 5, line 7- page 6, line 20; page 8, lines 9-17)

a device information providing function having an equivalent structure, which is

equivalent to the prescribed structure of the layout data but is not converted from

acquired document data, and displaying the display data through the display function

(page 5, line 7- page 6, line 20; page 7, line 9- page 8, line 17; page 27, lines 1-8; page

35, lines 3-20: Here, information about the device is obtained. Based upon this

information, the display is generated via a proxy server to define a device specific

display. Additionally, the analyzed document may have portions of the screen, or the

content areas, "seized" for the insertion of display objects, such as system messages).

Beranek fails to specifically disclose wherein a device information providing unit

which acquires the device internal information of the one or more information devices,

displays data contains device internal information. However, Fisher discloses a device

information providing unit which acquires the device internal information of the one or

more information devices, converts the acquired device internal information into display

data, and displays data contains device internal information (Figure 1; paragraph 0018:

Here, system information is obtained about each system. This system information is

loaded into a page generation module, which displays the system information within a

web page template). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the applicant's invention to have combined Fisher with Beranek, since it would

have allowed a user to view device specific parameters.

As per dependent claim 2, Beranek discloses the device information displaying

system wherein the device information providing unit has stylized data corresponding to

the type of information device to be used as a base of the display data (page 8, line 9-

17).

As per dependent claim 3, Beranek discloses wherein the stylized data are

prepared in multiple type corresponding to the types of information devices (page 2,

lines 9-20).

As per dependent claim 4, Beranek discloses wherein the device information

providing unit further has a function of writing operation information, including at least

one of setting information and a control instruction, into the one or more information devices (Figure 6: Here, the remove/replace operation is a rewrite of page information).

As per dependent claim 5, Beranek discloses wherein the device information providing unit includes a device information interface which functions as an interface for receiving a request signal according to a prescribed procedure and executing the acquisition of the device internal information from the one or more information devices and the writing of the operation information according to the request signal (Figure 4: Here, the HTTP Proxy acts as the interface between the client browser and the server).

As per dependent claim 6, Beranek discloses wherein:

the information browsing unit and the device information unit and the device information providing unit are implemented in one information device (Figure 4: Here, the client contains a browsing unit)

the device information interface acquires the device internal information of the one information device (Figure 4; column 8, lines 9-17)

As per dependent claim 7, Beranek discloses wherein the device information interface is connected to the one or more information devices via a wired and/or wireless network and acquires the device internal information from the one or more information devices via the network (Figure 1).

As per dependent claim 8, Beranek discloses wherein the one or more information devices include at least one of a cellular phone, a home information appliance, and a vehicle-mounted device (Figure 2A).

As per dependent claim 9, Beranek discloses wherein the device internal information includes at least one of information on the types of the information devices and information on peripheral devices of each of the one or more information devices (page 8, lines 9-17).

As per claims 10-18, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claims 1-9, respectively. Claims 10-18 are similarly rejected.

As per claim 19, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1. Claim 19 is similarly rejected.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 26 July 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant's initial argument is based upon the belief that the prior art fails to disclose generation of display data containing the device internal information and having an equivalent structure, which is equivalent to the prescribed structure generated by the information browsing unit but is not converted from acquired document data (page 7-8). The examiner respectfully disagrees. Beranek discloses a device information display system for displaying device internal information of one or more information devices, comprising an information browsing unit which acquires and analyzes document data described in a markup language, converts the acquired document data into layout data having a prescribed structure based on results of the analysis, and makes a display based on the layout data (page 5, line 7- page 6, line 20; page 8, lines 9-17).

Additionally, Beranek discloses a device information providing function having an

equivalent structure, which is equivalent to the prescribed structure of the layout data

but is not converted from acquired document data, and displaying the display data

through the display function (page 5, line 7- page 6, line 20; page 7, line 9- page 8, line

17; page 27, lines 1-8; page 35, lines 3-20). The, information about the device is

obtained, and based upon this information, the display is generated via a proxy server

to define a device specific display. Additionally, the analyzed document may have

portions of the screen, or the content areas, "seized" for the insertion of display objects,

such as system messages. This allows for content to be inserted into the acquired

document, while maintaining the layout look and feel of the document.

Beranek fails to specifically disclose wherein a device information providing unit

which acquires the device internal information of the one or more information devices,

displays data contains device internal information. However, Fisher discloses a device

information providing unit which acquires the device internal information of the one or

more information devices, converts the acquired device internal information into display

data, and displays data contains device internal information (Figure 1; paragraph 0018).

In this system, system information is obtained. This system information is loaded into a

page generation module, which displays the system information by populating areas

within a web page template. These areas area substantially similar to the "seized"

areas taught by Beranek.

The applicant further argues that the teachings of Beranek and Fisher would

require the data to be stored, and that this provides an undesirable process overhead

and resource consumption (pages 8-9). However, a limitation requiring that the data not

be stored does not exist within the claims. Although the claims are interpreted in light of

the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In

re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). For these reasons,

these arguments are not persuasive.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to KYLE R. STORK whose telephone number is (571)272-

4130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kyle R Stork/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2178